

# EXHIBIT D

1 JONATHAN H. BLAVIN, SBN 230269  
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
2 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3089  
3 Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
4 Email: Jonathan.Blavin@mto.com

5 ROSE L. EHLER, SBN 296523  
VICTORIA A. DEGTYAREVA, SBN 284199  
6 ARIEL T. TESHUVA, SBN 324238  
FAYE PAUL TELLER, SBN 343506  
7 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor  
8 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
9 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702  
Email: Rose.Ehler@mto.com  
10 Email: Victoria.Degtyareva@mto.com  
Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com  
11 Email: Faye.Teller@mto.com

12 LAUREN A. BELL (*pro hac vice*)  
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
13 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,  
Suite 500 E  
14 Washington, D.C. 20001-5369  
Telephone: (202) 220-1100  
15 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300  
Email: Lauren.Bell@mto.com

16 *Attorneys for Snap Inc.*

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18  
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT  
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY  
21 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION,

Case No. 4:22-MD-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

**SNAP INC.'S RESPONSES AND  
OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS'  
SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

22 This Document Relates to:

23 ALL ACTIONS  
24  
25

26 PROPOUNDING PARTY: MDL Personal Injury and Local Government Plaintiffs

27 RESPONDING PARTY: Snap Inc.

28 SET NO.: 2

1 DATE OF SERVICE: October 1, 2024

2 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Snap Inc.  
3 (“Snap”) hereby objects and responds to Plaintiffs’ Interrogatories, Set 2 (“Interrogatories”), as  
4 follows:

5 **OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS’ INSTRUCTIONS, RULES OF**  
6 **CONSTRUCTION, AND DEFINITIONS**

7 The following objections apply to and are incorporated by reference into each and every  
8 response to the separately numbered Interrogatories as if set forth in full therein. From time to  
9 time a specific response may repeat one of these objections for emphasis or for some other reason.  
10 The failure to repeat any of these objections in any specific response shall not be interpreted as a  
11 waiver of any objection to that response.

12 1. Snap’s responses, regardless of whether they include a specific objection, do not  
13 constitute an adoption or acceptance of the definitions and instructions that Plaintiffs seek to  
14 impose.

15 2. Snap objects to and has not considered Plaintiffs’ “instructions” or “definitions” to  
16 the extent they purport to impose obligations on Snap inconsistent with or in addition to those  
17 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the local rules of the Northern District of  
18 California, or any other applicable rules or law.

19 3. Snap’s responses reflect the current state of Snap’s knowledge and information  
20 gained through its reasonable investigation in this action regarding the information Plaintiffs have  
21 requested. Snap’s investigation and discovery in this action are ongoing, and Snap is continuing to  
22 evaluate what information may exist, how far back it is kept, and what burden may be associated  
23 with answering these Interrogatories and producing information (if it even exists). Snap may learn  
24 of additional information pertaining to the Interrogatories. Snap reserves the right to revise or  
25 supplement its responses to the Interrogatories without assuming any additional obligation to do  
26 so.

27 4. A response to an Interrogatory shall not be deemed a waiver of any applicable  
28 objection, including privilege, immunity, or protection, or an admission of relevancy. Snap

1 responds on the condition that the inadvertent production and/or disclosure of privileged or  
2 otherwise protected information does not waive any of Snap's rights to protect such information,  
3 all of which are expressly reserved, and that Snap may withdraw any such information  
4 inadvertently produced and/or disclosed as soon as identified. *See* ECF No. 248. By producing,  
5 agreeing to produce, or identifying documents or information in response to any Interrogatory,  
6 Snap does not concede that any aspect of Plaintiffs' claims related to those topics are permissible  
7 under Section 230, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and corresponding  
8 provisions of applicable State constitutions, or are otherwise relevant to this litigation.

9         5. Snap objects to the definition of the terms "Child or Children" because it rests on  
10 inaccurate assumptions; Snap does not allow users who it knows to be under the age of thirteen  
11 (13) to use its platform.

12         6. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Daily App Session Count" to the extent  
13 it purports to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are  
14 not already maintained in the ordinary course of business.

15         7. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Identity," and definition of the term  
16 "Identify" incorporating it by reference, as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not relevant or  
17 proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it calls for the addresses of persons, all  
18 titles/positions and dates each person has held, each of their present and past positions in Snap's  
19 structure, the Identities of all persons to whom they report or have reported directly or indirectly,  
20 Identities of all persons who report or reported to them directly and indirectly, their present and  
21 past functions, duties, activities and responsibilities, their present place of employment, and the  
22 location where they worked; and with respect to numbers, the source(s) of numbers provided.

23                 For purposes of responding to these Interrogatories, Snap will define "Identity" to  
24 mean, with respect to natural Persons: their full name, the title/position they held while in the  
25 position at Snap pertinent to the corresponding Interrogatory, and the dates they held that position;  
26 with respect to non-natural Persons, organizational persons, or Units: their full name and their  
27 Snap lead; and with respect to a number, the number as known to Snap with the degree of  
28

1 precision available to Snap as it is kept in the ordinary course of business and obtainable pursuant  
2 to a reasonable search.

3 8. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Inferred Age” as vague and ambiguous  
4 to the extent it seeks the age Snap “believes a user to be.” Snap objects to the definition of the  
5 term “Inferred Age” to the extent it purports to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in  
6 formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business.  
7 Snap specifically objects to providing data on users by specific Inferred Age, because in the  
8 ordinary course of business, Snap only assigns an inferred age range to users rather than an  
9 inferred specific age.

10 9. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Lifetime value” as vague and ambiguous  
11 to the extent the first definition of “the net profit You estimate will be attributable to a given  
12 Snapchat user over the duration of their use of Snapchat” is inconsistent with the second definition  
13 of “and/or the definition given to the term by Snap, as reflected in Snap’s document production.  
14 *See, e.g.*, SNAP0774624 at -4635.” Snap further objects to the definition of the term “Lifetime  
15 value” to the extent it purports to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not  
16 already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business.

17 10. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Named Features” as vague and  
18 ambiguous because the cited paragraphs (¶¶ 845 and 864 of the Second Amended Master  
19 Complaint (MDL), ECF No. 494, and/or ¶¶ 838, 861, and 930 of the Master Complaint (JCCP))  
20 do not contain lists of Snapchat features, but rather alternative designs Plaintiffs claim Defendants  
21 failed to implement on their platforms. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Named  
22 Features” as seeking information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party and not  
23 proportional to the needs of the case to the extent the information sought pertains to platform  
24 features that the Court may conclude or has already concluded cannot support a viable cause of  
25 action in this matter, because such allegations directly target Snap’s role as a publisher of third-  
26 party content. Specifically, Snap objects to the extent the term defines features for which  
27 allegations are barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by  
28 this Court’s decision on the Motion to Dismiss in its November 14, 2023 Order (ECF No. 430,

1 “Motion to Dismiss Order”) at 16–19, 22, and allegations implicated by any pending motions.  
2 Snap reserves all rights with respect to the Section 230 and First Amendment issues implicated by  
3 the Court’s Motion to Dismiss Order, Magistrate Judge Kang’s guidance, and the scope of  
4 discovery.

5 11. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Null Age” to the extent it purports to  
6 require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already  
7 maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Null  
8 Age” to the extent it is inconsistent with the term’s use in the document with Bates number  
9 SNAP0542582, as that document refers to “Null Inferred Age.”

10 12. Snap objects to the definition of the terms “Person or Persons” as overly broad,  
11 unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. For purposes of responding to  
12 the Interrogatories, Snap construes the terms “Person or Persons” to mean “natural person.”

13 13. Snap objects to the definition of the terms “Policy or Policies” as overly broad,  
14 unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case.

15 14. Snap objects to Plaintiffs’ definition of the term “Reported Age” as “the age a user  
16 identifies ... during the account creation process” because users 18 or over may change the date of  
17 birth information associated with their account using user settings. For the purposes of responding  
18 to the following Interrogatories, “Reported Age” means the age deducible from the most recent  
19 date of birth provided by the user at the time the user data is accessed.

20 15. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Safety” to the extent the term defines  
21 third-party harms for which allegations are barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment,  
22 including allegations held barred by this Court’s Motion to Dismiss Order at 16–19, 22, and  
23 allegations implicated by pending motions. Because claims based on third-party harm are  
24 precluded as a matter of law, discovery into third-party actions on Defendants’ platforms (e.g.,  
25 grooming, sextortion, bullying and CSAM) is unwarranted. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) (discovery  
26 must be “relevant to any party’s claim or defense”). Snap further objects to the definition of the  
27 term “Safety” as vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use of the undefined terms “wellbeing,”  
28 “safety,” “physical or mental health,” and “protection from risks.” Snap reserves all rights with

1 respect to the Section 230 and First Amendment issues implicated by the Court's Motion to  
2 Dismiss Order, Magistrate Judge Kang's guidance, and the scope of discovery.

3       16. Snap objects to the definition of "Safety Feature" as vague, ambiguous, overbroad  
4 and unduly burdensome in that it seeks information on "any protection, tool, intervention, or  
5 feature Snap has implemented" and is not limited as to time. Snap objects to the definition of the  
6 term "Safety Feature" as vague and ambiguous in that it seeks information about features "directed  
7 at" the Safety of Youth. Snap further objects to the definition of the term "Safety" that Plaintiffs  
8 incorporate by reference to the extent the term defines third-party harms for which allegations are  
9 barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court's  
10 Motion to Dismiss Order at 16–19, 22, and allegations implicated by pending motions. Because  
11 claims based on third-party harm are precluded as a matter of law, discovery into third-party  
12 actions on Defendants' platforms (e.g., grooming, sextortion, bullying and CSAM) is unwarranted.  
13 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) (discovery must be "relevant to any party's claim or defense"). Snap  
14 further objects to the definition of the term "Safety" as vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use  
15 of the undefined terms "wellbeing," "safety," "physical or mental health," and "protection from  
16 risks." Snap further objects to the definition of the term "Youth" that Plaintiffs incorporate by  
17 reference to include users aged eighteen (18) and over as overly broad in that it seeks information  
18 that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party. This litigation concerns social media use  
19 by adolescents and minors under eighteen (18) years of age. For purposes of responding to the  
20 Interrogatories, Snap construes "Youth" to mean users under the age of eighteen (18). For  
21 purposes of responding to the Interrogatories, Snap also construes "minors" as users under the age  
22 of eighteen (18).

23       17. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Selected Financial Data" to the extent  
24 the information sought is already in the possession of Plaintiffs. The term is defined as information  
25 contained in Snap's Form 10-K filings, which Snap has already produced to Plaintiffs.

26       18. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Session" as vague and ambiguous to the  
27 extent it is defined to include "each time a user ...does something." Snap also objects to the  
28 definition of the term "Session" to the extent it purports to require Snap to produce or aggregate

1 data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of  
2 business.

3 19. Snap objects to Plaintiffs' definition of the terms "You," "Your," "Defendant," and  
4 "Defendants" on the grounds that the definition is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly  
5 burdensome. Snap further objects to the definition to the extent it seeks information not currently  
6 in the possession, custody, or control of Snap. Snap will respond solely on behalf of itself (Snap  
7 Inc.) and not any other subsidiaries or affiliates, or any other person or entity. Snap further objects  
8 to the definition on the grounds that it includes Snap's attorneys and requires Snap to provide a  
9 legal conclusion or to produce information that is protected by any privilege, including the  
10 attorney-client privilege, work product immunity doctrine, common interest privilege, or any other  
11 applicable privilege, immunity, or restriction on discovery. For purposes of responding to the  
12 Interrogatories, "You," "Your," "Defendant," and "Defendants" will be defined as Snap Inc. and  
13 those authorized agents and employees acting on its behalf and within the scope of their agency or  
14 employment.

15 Snap confirms that no Snap subsidiary or affiliate is involved with the Snapchat  
16 application. Accordingly, Snap will not search for or produce, and thus will withhold, information  
17 relating to Snap subsidiaries or affiliates.

18 20. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Time Between App Sessions" as vague  
19 and ambiguous and resting on inaccurate assumptions, to the extent it seems to suggest that the  
20 amount of time between each Session in a day is consistent for any given Session or user. Snap  
21 also objects to the definition of the term "Time Between App Sessions" to the extent it purports to  
22 require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already  
23 maintained in the ordinary course of business.

24 21. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Time Spent per App Session" as vague  
25 and ambiguous and resting on inaccurate assumptions, to the extent it seems to suggest that the  
26 time a user spends on Snapchat in a session is consistent across users. Snap objects to the  
27 definition of the term "Time Spent per App Session" to the extent it purports to require Snap to  
28



1 produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the  
2 ordinary course of business.

3 22. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Unidentified Age” to the extent it  
4 purports to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not  
5 already maintained in the ordinary course of business.

6 23. Snap objects to the definition of the terms “Snapchat Platform” and “Your  
7 Platform” because they are directed to the Snapchat platform as a whole, rather than the specific  
8 features that the Court has concluded can provide the basis for a viable cause of action in this  
9 matter, and to the extent the information sought is not reasonably accessible to Snap upon  
10 reasonable diligence. Snap further objects that the term “Snapchat Platform” is vague, ambiguous,  
11 and overbroad in its use of the undefined terms “developed, tested, or made available for use,” and  
12 “all features or surfaces accessible to some or all users of the platform.”

13 24. Snap objects to the definition of the term “Youth” to include users aged eighteen  
14 (18) and over as overly broad in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or  
15 defenses of any party. This litigation concerns social media use by adolescents and minors under  
16 eighteen (18) years of age. For purposes of responding to the Interrogatories, Snap construes  
17 “Youth” to mean users under the age of eighteen (18). For purposes of responding to the  
18 Interrogatories, Snap also construes “minors” as users under the age of eighteen (18).

19 25. Snap objects to the definition of the Relevant Time Period for the information  
20 sought as overly broad and unduly burdensome. The Court has ordered that the Relevant Time  
21 Period for Snap, to the extent Plaintiffs seek information from Snap unrelated to specific Named  
22 Features in these cases, begins January 1, 2015, and the parties have agreed to April 1, 2024 as an  
23 end date. *See* June 20, 2024 Order Resolving Discovery Dispute Letter Briefs, at 10 (ECF No.  
24 953). To the extent these Interrogatories are unrelated to specific Named Features in these cases,  
25 Plaintiffs’ designation of a different time period violates that Order and the parties’ agreement. For  
26 purposes of responding to these Interrogatories, Snap will respond in accordance with the Court’s  
27 June 20, 2024 order and the parties’ agreement: with respect to Interrogatories concerning one or  
28 more of the Named Features, Snap construes the term “Relevant Time Period” to run from January

1 of the year the Named Feature was released on Snapchat to April 1, 2024. With respect to Interrogatories that do not concern any of the Named Features, Snap construes the term “Relevant Time Period” to be from January 1, 2015 to April 1, 2024.

## **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES**

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Identify Your estimate of a Snapchat user’s Lifetime Value to You. To the extent this estimate varies based on user characteristics, including but not limited to Reported Age of first use, Inferred Age of first use, or other demographic criteria, identify each such estimate.

### **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Snap objects to the definition of the term “Lifetime value” as vague and ambiguous to the extent the first definition of “the net profit You estimate will be attributable to a given Snapchat user over the duration of their use of Snapchat” is inconsistent with the second definition of “and/or the definition given to the term by Snap, as reflected in Snap’s document production. *See, e.g.,* SNAP0774624 at -4635.” Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms “Reported Age” and “Inferred Age,” in particular to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to the phrase “other demographic criteria” as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding at least three separate categories of users (or more depending on the meaning of demographic criteria), each of which purports to require a separate set of responses. *See Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-CV-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (interrogatories are “compound” when “each subpart . . . can be fully answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as at least three separate Interrogatories. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks detailed technical

information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the production and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of the case because the Interrogatory is not limited as to time.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden; and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding that this Interrogatory will count as a separate Interrogatory against Plaintiffs' total allotment of Interrogatories for each demographic criteria included, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

## **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify the number of domestic Snapchat users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0 and 100, and each Inferred Age between 0 and 100.

## **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms "Reported Age," "Null Age," "Unknown Age," and "Inferred Age," in particular to the extent they purport to

1 require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already  
2 maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad,  
3 unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding three  
4 separate categories of users for each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which  
5 purports to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range  
6 of years counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-  
7 0764 OWW DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in  
8 a five-year range is “separate and distinct” and treating the interrogatory as “five separate  
9 interrogatories”). *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006);  
10 *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-  
11 HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (“each subpart . . . can be fully  
12 answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 30  
13 separate Interrogatories. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce  
14 or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary  
15 course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
16 proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it calls for obtaining data out of cold storage.  
17 Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks detailed technical information or raw data  
18 that is irrelevant to this case, and the production and/or aggregation of which would be highly  
19 burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to  
20 this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade  
21 secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs  
22 of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery  
23 concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap further objects to this Interrogatory as resting on  
24 inaccurate assumptions to the extent it seeks information about Snapchat users under the age of  
25 thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow people who it knows to be under the age of thirteen (13) to  
26 use its platform and therefore does not have data on such users. Snap incorporates by reference its  
27 objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly  
28

1 burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the  
2 Court and between the parties.

3 Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with  
4 Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be  
5 reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and  
6 proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;  
7 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
8 that this Interrogatory will count as 30 Interrogatories against Plaintiffs' total allotment of  
9 Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows  
10 the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed  
11 the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

13 For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify by decile the Time Spent Per App  
14 Session for domestic Snapchat users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0 and  
15 100, and each Inferred Age between 0 and 100.

16 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

17 Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms "Time Spent  
18 Per App Session," "Reported Age," "Null Age," "Unknown Age," and "Inferred Age," in  
19 particular to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do  
20 not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to  
21 the term "decile" as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad,  
22 unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding three  
23 separate categories of users for each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which  
24 purports to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range  
25 of years counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-  
26 0764 OWW DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in  
27 a five-year range is "separate and distinct" and treating the interrogatory as "five separate  
28 interrogatories"). *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006);

*American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (“each subpart . . . can be fully answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 30 separate Interrogatories. Moreover, this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because by serving 30 Interrogatories here, Plaintiffs will have exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang once Snap has provided this information for only one category of information for six years of the Relevant Time Period. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it calls for obtaining data out of cold storage. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the production and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap further objects to this Interrogatory as resting on inaccurate assumptions to the extent it seeks information about Snapchat users under the age of thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow people who it knows to be under the age of thirteen (13) to use its platform and therefore does not have data on such users. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;

1 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
 2 that this Interrogatory will count as 30 Interrogatories against Plaintiffs' total allotment of  
 3 Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows  
 4 the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed  
 5 the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

7 For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify by decile the Daily App Session Count  
 8 for domestic Snapchat users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0 and 100, and  
 9 each Inferred Age between 0 and 100.

10 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

11 Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms "Daily App  
 12 Session Count," "Reported Age," "Null Age," "Unknown Age," and "Inferred Age," in particular  
 13 to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not  
 14 already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to the  
 15 term "decile" as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly  
 16 burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding three separate  
 17 categories of users for each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which purports  
 18 to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range of years  
 19 counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-0764 OWW  
 20 DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in a five-year  
 21 range is "separate and distinct" and treating the interrogatory as "five separate interrogatories").  
 22 *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *American Bankers*  
 23 *Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020  
 24 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) ("each subpart . . . can be fully answered without  
 25 addressing the other subparts"). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 30 separate  
 26 Interrogatories. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang's  
 27 March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because Plaintiffs  
 28 have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to this



1 Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not  
2 already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this  
3 Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to  
4 the extent it calls for obtaining data out of cold storage. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the  
5 extent it seeks detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the  
6 production and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are  
7 disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent  
8 that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap  
9 objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not  
10 relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or  
11 over. Snap further objects to this Interrogatory as resting on inaccurate assumptions to the extent it  
12 seeks information about Snapchat users under the age of thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow  
13 people who it knows to be under the age of thirteen (13) to use its platform and therefore does not  
14 have data on such users. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period  
15 and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks  
16 information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

17       Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with  
18 Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be  
19 reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and  
20 proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;  
21 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
22 that this Interrogatory will count as 30 Interrogatories against Plaintiffs' total allotment of  
23 Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows  
24 the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed  
25 the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.



1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

2 For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify by decile the typical Time Between  
3 App Sessions for domestic Snapchat users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0  
4 and 100, and each Inferred Age between 0 and 100.

5 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

6 Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms “Time Between  
7 App Sessions,” “Reported Age,” “Null Age,” “Unknown Age,” and “Inferred Age,” in particular  
8 to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not  
9 already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to the  
10 term “decile” as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly  
11 burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding three separate  
12 categories of users for each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which purports  
13 to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range of years  
14 counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-0764 OWW  
15 DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in a five-year  
16 range is “separate and distinct” and treating the interrogatory as “five separate interrogatories”).  
17 *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *American Bankers*  
18 *Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020  
19 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (“each subpart . . . can be fully answered without  
20 addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 30 separate  
21 Interrogatories. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang’s  
22 March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because Plaintiffs  
23 have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to this  
24 Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not  
25 already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this  
26 Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to  
27 the extent it calls for obtaining data out of cold storage. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the  
28 extent it seeks detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the

production and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap further objects to this Interrogatory as resting on inaccurate assumptions to the extent it seeks information about Snapchat users under the age of thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow people who it knows to be under the age of thirteen (13) to use its platform and therefore does not have data on such users. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden; and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding that this Interrogatory will count as 30 Interrogatories against Plaintiffs' total allotment of Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify the average revenue per user for domestic Snapchat users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0 and 100, and each Inferred Age between 0 and 100.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Snap incorporates by reference its objections to the definitions of the terms "Reported Age," "Null Age," "Unknown Age," and "Inferred Age," in particular to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already

1 maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad,  
2 unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it seeks information regarding three  
3 separate categories of users for each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which  
4 purports to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range  
5 of years counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-  
6 0764 OWW DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in  
7 a five-year range is “separate and distinct” and treating the interrogatory as “five separate  
8 interrogatories”). *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006);  
9 *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-  
10 HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (“each subpart . . . can be fully  
11 answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 30  
12 separate Interrogatories. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge  
13 Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because  
14 Plaintiffs have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to  
15 the term “average revenue per user” as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to  
16 the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are  
17 not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as  
18 overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it  
19 calls for obtaining data out of cold storage. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks  
20 detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the production and/or  
21 aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the  
22 legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the  
23 production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this  
24 Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable  
25 claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap further  
26 objects to this Interrogatory as resting on inaccurate assumptions to the extent it seeks information  
27 about Snapchat users under the age of thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow people who it knows  
28 to be under the age of thirteen (13) to use its platform and therefore does not have data on such

1 users. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this  
 2 Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond  
 3 the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

4 Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with  
 5 Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be  
 6 reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and  
 7 proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;  
 8 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
 9 that this Interrogatory will count as 30 Interrogatories against Plaintiffs' total allotment of  
 10 Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows  
 11 the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed  
 12 the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

14 For each year in the Relevant Time Period, identify the Selected Financial Data for Snap.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

16 Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the definition of the term "Selected  
 17 Financial Data." "Selected Financial Data" is defined as information contained in Snap's Form 10-  
 18 K filings, which Snap has already produced to Plaintiffs from the Relevant Time Period. Snap thus  
 19 objects to this Interrogatory to the extent the information sought is already in the possession of  
 20 Plaintiffs, and is otherwise equally accessible through publicly-available sources. Snap objects that  
 21 this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it  
 22 seeks information as to each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period. An interrogatory  
 23 seeking information from a range of years counts as a separate interrogatory for each year.  
 24 *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-0764 OWW DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal.  
 25 May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in a five-year range is "separate and distinct" and treating the  
 26 interrogatory as "five separate interrogatories"). *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232  
 27 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co.*  
 28 *of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020)

(“each subpart . . . can be fully answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as ten separate Interrogatories. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because Plaintiffs have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap responds that the data Plaintiffs seek can be found in its annual Form 10-K filings with the SEC, which are publicly available and which Snap produced in Production Volume SNAP009 on April 24, 2024 with the following Bates stamps: SNAP0003628; SNAP0003762; SNAP0003912; SNAP0004052; SNAP0004209; SNAP0004358; SNAP0004527.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

Describe the development and implementation of each Safety Feature from the creation of Snapchat through the date of service of this interrogatory. For purposes of this interrogatory, “describe” means to identify the following for each Safety Feature: (i) the date on which the feature was first made available on Snapchat; (ii) the Person(s) with primary responsibility for the feature during each year of the Relevant Time Period; (iii) a general description of the feature’s intended purpose; (iv) all names by which the feature has been known internally and/or promoted externally; (v) the population of users or non-users (e.g. parents without Snapchat accounts) to whom You made the feature available; (vi) whether the feature is applied by default or must be opted into by a user; (vii) whether and how You notify users about or encourage users to adopt the feature, either during account creation or at any other time; and (viii) whether the feature is still available to users on the Snapchat Platform.

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

2 Snap objects to the definition of “Safety Feature” as vague, ambiguous, overbroad and  
 3 unduly burdensome in that it seeks information on “any protection, tool, intervention, or feature  
 4 Snap has implemented” and is not limited as to time. Snap objects to the definition of the term  
 5 “Safety Feature” as vague and ambiguous in that it seeks information about features “directed at”  
 6 the Safety of Youth. Snap further objects to the definition of the term “Safety” that Plaintiffs  
 7 incorporate by reference to the extent the term defines third-party harms for which allegations are  
 8 barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court’s  
 9 Motion to Dismiss Order at 16–19, 22, and allegations implicated by pending motions. Because  
 10 claims based on third-party harm are precluded as a matter of law, discovery into third-party  
 11 actions on Defendants’ platforms (e.g., grooming, sextortion, bullying and CSAM) is unwarranted.  
 12 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) (discovery must be “relevant to any party’s claim or defense”). Snap  
 13 further objects to the definition of the term “Safety” as vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use  
 14 of the undefined terms “wellbeing,” “safety,” “physical or mental health,” and “protection from  
 15 risks.” Snap further objects to the definition of the term “Youth” that Plaintiffs incorporate by  
 16 reference to include users aged eighteen (18) and over as overly broad in that it seeks information  
 17 that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party. Snap further objects that this  
 18 Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and impermissibly compound in that it seeks  
 19 eight categories of information for every Safety Feature on Snapchat, each of which purports to  
 20 require a separate response. *See Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal.  
 21 2006); *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-  
 22 02237-HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020). Snap therefore counts this  
 23 Interrogatory as eight separate Interrogatories for each Safety Feature, and Snapchat has many  
 24 more than one Safety Feature. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate  
 25 Judge Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because  
 26 Plaintiffs have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to  
 27 the term “Person(s) with primary responsibility for the feature” as vague and ambiguous, and will  
 28 construe the Interrogatory to seek “person(s) with responsibility for the feature.” Snap objects to

the terms “development,” “implementation,” “made available” and “intended purpose” as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information in support of allegations barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court’s Motion to Dismiss Order and allegations implicated by pending motions. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden; and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding that this Interrogatory will count as eight Interrogatories per Safety Feature against Plaintiffs’ total allotment of Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory that narrows the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories that exceed the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

For each year during the Relevant Time Period, identify the percentage rate of adoption for each Safety Feature by domestic users of Null or Unknown Age, each Reported Age between 0



1 and 100, and each Inferred Age between 0 and 100. To the extent a Safety Feature is made  
 2 available only to non-users (i.e. parents or guardians) identify the percentage rate of adoption as kept  
 3 by You in the ordinary course of business.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

5 Snap objects to the definition of “Safety Feature” as vague, ambiguous, overbroad and  
 6 unduly burdensome in that it seeks information on “any protection, tool, intervention, or feature  
 7 Snap has implemented” and is not limited as to time. Snap objects to the definition of the term  
 8 “Safety Feature” as vague and ambiguous in that it seeks information about features “directed at”  
 9 the Safety of Youth. Snap further objects to the definition of the term “Safety” that Plaintiffs  
 10 incorporate by reference to the extent the term defines third-party harms for which allegations are  
 11 barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court’s  
 12 Motion to Dismiss Order at 16–19, 22, and allegations implicated by pending motions. Because  
 13 claims based on third-party harm are precluded as a matter of law, discovery into third-party  
 14 actions on Defendants’ platforms (e.g., grooming, sextortion, bullying and CSAM) is unwarranted.  
 15 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) (discovery must be “relevant to any party’s claim or defense”). Snap  
 16 further objects to the definition of the term “Safety” as vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use  
 17 of the undefined terms “wellbeing,” “safety,” “physical or mental health,” and “protection from  
 18 risks.” Snap further objects to the definition of the term “Youth” that Plaintiffs incorporate by  
 19 reference to include users aged eighteen (18) and over as overly broad in that it seeks information  
 20 that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party. Snap incorporates by reference its  
 21 objections to the definitions of the terms “Reported Age,” “Null Age,” “Unknown Age,” and  
 22 “Inferred Age,” in particular to the extent they purport to require Snap to produce or aggregate  
 23 data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of  
 24 business. Snap objects that this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
 25 impermissibly compound in that for each Safety Feature, it seeks information regarding four  
 26 separate categories of users from each of the ten years of the Relevant Time Period, each of which  
 27 purports to require a separate set of responses. An interrogatory seeking information from a range  
 28 of years counts as a separate interrogatory for each year. *Waterbury v. Scribner*, No. 1:05-CV-



0764 OWW DLB PC, 2008 WL 2018432, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2008) (finding that each year in a five-year range is “separate and distinct” and treating the interrogatory as “five separate interrogatories”). *See also Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020) (“each subpart . . . can be fully answered without addressing the other subparts”). Snap therefore counts this Interrogatory as 40 separate Interrogatories for each Safety Feature, and Snapchat has many more than one Safety Feature. Moreover, Snap objects that this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because Plaintiffs have already exceeded the limit of 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as vague and ambiguous to the extent it relies on the phrase “percentage rate of adoption.” Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it calls for obtaining data out of cold storage. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the production and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information in support of allegations barred by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court’s Motion to Dismiss Order and allegations implicated by pending motions. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap further objects to this Interrogatory as resting on inaccurate assumptions to the extent it

1 seeks information about Snapchat users under the age of thirteen (13), as Snap does not allow  
 2 people who it knows to be under the age of thirteen (13) to use its platform and therefore does not  
 3 have data on such users. Snap incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period  
 4 and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks  
 5 information beyond the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

6 Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with  
 7 Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be  
 8 reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and  
 9 proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;  
 10 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
 11 that this Interrogatory will count as 40 Interrogatories per Safety Feature against Plaintiffs' total  
 12 allotment of Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended Interrogatory  
 13 that narrows the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any Interrogatories  
 14 that exceed the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

16 For each Named Feature, identify the following: (i) the date on which the Feature was first  
 17 implemented on Your Platform; (ii) the Person(s) with primary responsibility for the feature  
 18 during each year of the Relevant Time Period; and (iii) major modifications to each Named Feature  
 19 and when each such modification was implemented on Your Platform. For purposes of this  
 20 Interrogatory, "major modification" means any change that materially improves and/or alters the  
 21 source code, capacity, functionality, and/or the method of operation.

22 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

23 Snap objects to the definition of the term "Named Features" as vague and ambiguous  
 24 because the cited paragraphs - ¶¶ 845 and 864 of the Second Amended Master Complaint (MDL),  
 25 ECF No. 494, and/or ¶¶ 838, 861, and 930 of the Master Complaint (JCCP) - do not contain lists  
 26 of Snapchat features, but rather alternative designs Plaintiffs claim Defendants failed to implement  
 27 on their platforms. Snap objects to the definition of the term "Named Features" as seeking  
 28 information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party and not proportional to the

1 needs of the case to the extent the information sought pertains to platform features that the Court  
2 may conclude or has already concluded cannot support a viable cause of action in this matter,  
3 because such allegations directly target Snap’s role as a publisher of third-party content.  
4 Specifically, Snap objects to the extent the term defines features for which allegations are barred  
5 by Section 230 or the First Amendment, including allegations held barred by this Court’s Motion  
6 to Dismiss Order at 16–19, 22, and allegations implicated by any pending motions. Snap objects  
7 that this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and impermissibly compound in that it  
8 contains three distinct sub-parts for each Named Feature, each of which purports to require a  
9 separate response. *See Trevino v. ACB American, Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006);  
10 *American Bankers Ins. Co. of Florida v. National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford*, No. 4:19-cv-02237-  
11 HSG (KAW), 2020 WL 8996760, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2020). Snap therefore counts this  
12 Interrogatory as at least three separate Interrogatories for each Named Feature. Snap objects that  
13 this Interrogatory is in violation of Magistrate Judge Kang’s March 7, 2024 Order Governing  
14 Discovery Limitations (ECF No. 672 at 1), because Plaintiffs have already exceeded the limit of  
15 45 Interrogatories set by Judge Kang. Snap objects to the definition of the term “major  
16 modification” as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and not relevant or proportional to the needs of  
17 the case, in that it would appear to encompass changes made to the feature that had no effect on  
18 user engagement or Safety. Snap objects to this Interrogatory as vague and ambiguous to the  
19 extent it relies on the term “Person(s) with primary responsibility for the feature,” and will  
20 construe the Interrogatory to seek “person(s) with responsibility for the feature.” Snap objects to  
21 the term “implemented” as vague and ambiguous. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it  
22 requires Snap to produce or aggregate data in formats that do not already exist or are not already  
23 maintained in the ordinary course of business. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it  
24 seeks detailed technical information or raw data that is irrelevant to this case, and the production  
25 and/or aggregation of which would be highly burdensome in ways that are disproportionate to the  
26 legitimate needs of the case. Snap objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the  
27 production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information. Snap objects to this  
28 Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client

1 privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will  
2 withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Snap objects to this  
3 Interrogatory as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable  
4 claim or defense to the extent it seeks discovery concerning users aged 18 or over. Snap  
5 incorporates by reference its objection to the Relevant Time Period and objects to this  
6 Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information beyond  
7 the Relevant Time Period established by the Court and between the parties.

8 Subject to and without waiving these objections, Snap is willing to meet and confer with  
9 Plaintiffs regarding the scope of this Interrogatory to determine (1) whether an agreement can be  
10 reached under which Snap provides certain information responsive to this Interrogatory and  
11 proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Snap to an undue burden;  
12 and (2) whether Plaintiffs would like Snap to provide responsive information on the understanding  
13 that this Interrogatory will count as three Interrogatories per Named Feature against Plaintiffs'  
14 total allotment of Interrogatories, or whether Plaintiffs would like to serve an amended  
15 Interrogatory that narrows the categories of requested information. Snap will not respond to any  
16 Interrogatories that exceed the limit of 45 Interrogatories that Plaintiffs are permitted to serve.

17 DATED: November 21, 2024

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

18  
19 By: /s/ Victoria A. Degtyareva  
20 VICTORIA A. DEGTYAREVA  
21 *Attorney for Snap Inc.*  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28